

REMARKS

By this amendment, Applicant is canceling claims 2 and 19 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 3, 6, 17, 29, 31-33, 38-39 and 47 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

This application has been rejected based on Jones and Jones in combination with Baker. Applicant disagrees that the references alone or in combination show all of the features of the claims.

Briefly, Jones describes a system for monitoring a location of a vehicle. An example application is in the commercial overnight package delivery industry. (Col. 2, line 15-16). Jones is not understood to describe an interoffice mail system.

Baker describes an interdepartmental mail sorting system. However, the reference requires identifying information such as the bar code shown in FIG. 1 to be unique for every envelope used in the system. See for example, column 2, lines 45-46. This information identifies the envelope rather than either the sender or recipient. These references do not teach all of the features of the claims.

For example, claim 1 recites a directory of entities within an organization from which the system can generate a record and a tag for each item.

Claim 29 recites a method of using a mail system within an organization wherein the system comprises a plug-in for an email system.

Claim 33 relates to a system for managing movement of interoffice items that includes a mechanism that can obtain an input from a user relating to an item and then redirect the item while it is in transit.

Claim 47 relates to an interoffice mail system that has an interface to a commercial carrier software system.

Neither reference shows or suggests these desirable features of the claims. Accordingly, each of the independent claims distinguishes over the cited references. The dependent claims add further limitations and further reasons for patentability.

For example, claim 20 relates to entering information at one location and having a tag being generated at a second location. Claim 32 recites that the sender can query the system for all items that have been sent by the sender over a specified time interval. As understood, the

Serial No.: 09/825,450
Conf. No.: 1789

- 14 -

Art Unit: 2152

references only describe the recipient querying the system for a specific item. This limitation is repeated in other claims such as claim 38.

Other dependent claims add further distinguishing limitations.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Respectfully submitted,
William Wheeler et al., Applicant(s)

By: 

Edmund J. Walsh, Reg. No. 45,054
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2211
Telephone: (617) 720-3500

Docket No. L0562.70015US00
Date: June 2, 2004
x06/24/04x